

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

It is asserted that these amendments do not add new matter and are supported by the specification and claims as originally filed. Entry of these claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 14-25, 27 and 29-31 have been rejected.

Claims 14-25 and 29-31 are kept unchanged.

Claims 26-28 are cancelled.

Claims 14-25 and 29-31 are pending in the application.

Claims 26 and 28 have been withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 14-25, 27 and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as obvious over WO 96/01245.

One of the inventive features of the instant claimed invention is the use of a specific polyoxyethylene (EO)/polyoxypropylene (OP) polymer of formula (I) whose number of EO (p) and PO (n) units have to be within the following selected claimed ranges:

- for OP: $3 \leq n \leq 6$, and

- for OE: $6 < p < 10$

WO 96/01245 teaches broader ranges. In the examples of that reference, the only series disclosed are series having OP=2 and OP=7.5, with different amounts of EO. That does not describe nor suggest that series having $3 \leq n \leq 6$ could be more interesting.

That claimed selection provides an unexpected effect: the degreasing power is greatly improved as showed in the examples and comparative examples of the instant specification. Indeed, comparative example 10 of the instant specification corresponds substantially to a compound disclosed in WO 96/01245 and called NOPOL 2OP 5.1EO (Please see example 2.6, and tables 1 and 2 of the reference).

In that connection, the table set forth on page 14 of the instant specification shows an unexpected improvement of the degreasing power. According to that table, the degreasing time has been more than 75% decreased: it is more than 120 seconds more than comparative example 10 of the instant specification who is similar to the above cited compound of the reference. The degreasing time is of only 30 seconds for the compounds of the invention. Therefore, the decrease is of a surprising rate of $(120-30)/120=75\%$.

For these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner now reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 14-25, 27 and 29-31 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as obvious over WO 96/01245.

RN99101
Serial number: 10/049,575
AMENDMENT

In view of the preceding remarks, it is asserted that the patent application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any question concerning these remarks that would further advance prosecution of the claims to allowance, the examiner is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned agent at (609) 860-4180. A notice of allowance is respectfully solicited.

October 31, 2003

Rhodia Inc. 259 Prospect Plains Road
CN7500
Cranbury, NJ 08512

RN9101.amend

Respectfully submitted

By 

Jean-Louis SEUGNET

Limited Recognition under 37 CFR §
10.9(b) enclosed.

Tel : (609) 860-4180

Fax: (609) 860-0503